

SAMPLE DELIVERABLE · BEH-02

Engagement Driver Analysis and Consequences Audit

What actually moves people here, measured by observation as well as survey, with the intervention sequence and the leadership worksheet that makes it stick.

Prepared for Fenwick Industries (fictional) by Red Cell Consulting

CONTENTS

01	Executive summary
02	Method: observed and surveyed
03	Driver scores and movement
04	Function heat view
05	Interventions: sequence and design
06	The consequences audit
07	Ninety-day reinforcement plan
08	About Red Cell Consulting

About this document

This is a sample of the deliverable Red Cell Consulting produces in a real engagement. Every organisation, figure and finding in it is fictional, and the structure, depth and standards are exactly what a client receives. Where a real engagement would cite source documents, the sample says so.

Executive summary

Fenwick's engagement problem is not morale in general. It is workload concentrated in two functions, tools that fight their users, and a recognition rhythm that varies wildly by manager.

The three findings that matter

Workload scores 33 and fell five points this quarter, concentrated in Operations and Service. Tools score 41 with two named systems producing most of the friction. Recognition averages a respectable 61 but ranges from 44 to 79 by team, which means it is a manager habit, not a program.

The sequence

Fix the tools first (cheap, fast, visible), plan the workload reset this quarter (expensive, essential), install a recognition rhythm alongside (free, compounding), and build career maps by year end. The order is chosen by impact against effort, not by comfort.

SCORES AT A GLANCE · 0-100

DRIVER	SCORE	MOVEMENT	SIGNAL
Role clarity	82	+6	Strength; protect through the restructure
Manager trust	74	+3	Solid and improving
Recognition	61	0	Manager-variable; rhythm missing
Autonomy	58	+1	Constrained by approval design
Growth path	49	-2	No visible maps; exits cite it
Tools and systems	41	0	Two systems named repeatedly
Workload	33	-5	The priority; two functions carry it

Method: observed and surveyed

Surveys alone flatter; observation alone misses meaning. The analysis uses both, and says which is which.

WHAT WAS COLLECTED

SOURCE	WHAT IT CONTRIBUTES	PRIVACY HANDLING
Survey, n = 214 (87 percent)	Driver scores, movement, verbatims	Anonymous; minimum group of ten for any cut
Calendar and meeting metadata	Meeting load, after-hours work patterns	Aggregated by function; no individual reporting
Decision-latency sampling	How long five common decisions actually take	Workflow timestamps, no names
Structured observation	Twelve meetings across functions: who speaks, what happens to bad news	Patterns reported, not incidents
Exit interview coding, 12 months	Stated and inferred leave reasons	Themes only

WHERE THE SOURCES DISAGREED, AND WHAT THAT MEANS

- Survey workload (bad) vs calendars (worse): after-hours activity in Operations runs 40 percent above what people report. Under-reporting of strain is itself a finding about safety to speak.
- Recognition scores middling, but observation found four teams with excellent informal rhythms. The practice exists in-house; it needs spreading, not inventing.
- Autonomy verbatims blame managers; decision-latency data blames the approval matrix. The design is the problem, which is better news: designs change faster than people.

Honesty about limits

This is organisational measurement, not clinical assessment. Where the data suggested individual strain, the response was a private route to support, never a report line. That boundary is why people answer honestly at all.

Function heat view

The average hides the problem. By function, the pattern is unmistakable.

DRIVER SCORES BY FUNCTION

DRIVER	OPERATIONS	SERVICE	SALES	CORPORATE	ENGINEERING
Role clarity	79	80	84	85	83
Manager trust	71	70	78	77	76
Recognition	55	52	72	66	64
Autonomy	54	51	66	60	62
Growth path	44	46	56	51	50
Tools and systems	36	34	52	48	45
Workload	26	29	44	41	38

READING THE HEAT

- Operations and Service carry the workload problem almost entirely; Sales is fine. A firm-wide wellbeing campaign would spend most of its budget on people who do not need it.
- Tools friction follows the same two functions, and the two named systems live exactly there. One fix, two drivers.
- Recognition's range (52-72) maps to individual managers, confirmed by observation. The four strong teams share one habit: specific, small, frequent.

Design consequence

Every intervention on the next page is targeted by function, not broadcast. Precision is respect: it fixes the problem where it lives and spares everyone else another initiative.

Interventions: sequence and design

Four interventions, sequenced by impact against effort, each with an owner, a cost and a measure.

1 · TOOLS FIX · NOW · OWNER: CTO

The two named systems get a four-week usability sprint: the eleven worst friction points (documented from observation) fixed or worked around, and a visible "you said, we changed" note per fix. Cost: engineering time already budgeted. Measure: tools driver, target 41 to 55 by next pulse.

2 · WORKLOAD RESET · THIS QUARTER · OWNER: COO

Operations and Service demand-to-roster analysis, the three chronic overload points redesigned (two are approval bottlenecks, one is a genuine staffing gap), and an agreed stop-list: work that ends so the new load is real. Cost: one backfill role, A\$85k. Measure: workload driver in the two functions, after-hours calendar signal, overtime spend.

3 · RECOGNITION RHYTHM · ALONGSIDE · OWNER: ALL MANAGERS, MODELLED BY CEO

Not a program: a habit. The practice from the four strong teams, written as a one-line standard (specific, small, frequent), demonstrated in every leadership meeting, and checked by its absence in the next pulse's range, not its average.

4 · CAREER MAPS · BY YEAR END · OWNER: CPO

Visible progression maps for the five biggest role families, built with current role-holders, each naming the observable capabilities that move someone forward. Measure: growth driver, regretted-exit rate over two quarters.

What was deliberately not proposed

A values refresh, a wellbeing app, and an engagement committee. Nothing in the data says language, apps or forums; the data says load, tools, rhythm and maps. Interventions follow evidence or they are theatre.

The consequences audit

The culture question that can actually be answered: what got rewarded, punished and ignored here in the last six months?

HOW TO RUN IT

- Leadership team, ninety minutes, no slides. Real events, named privately in the room, patterns shared beyond it.
- Fill the table from memory first, then check against decisions: promotions, plum assignments, quiet demotions, who presented at the last three all-hands.
- Line the patterns against the three behaviours you say you want. The gaps are the work.

THE WORKSHEET

EVENT (REAL, RECENT)	BEHAVIOUR SHOWN	WHAT FOLLOWED	WHAT IT TAUGHT EVERYONE WATCHING

PROMPTS THAT SURFACE THE TRUTH

- Who was promoted, and what story do people tell about why?
- What happened the last time someone raised a risk early? Missed a commitment?
- Which corners quietly get cut when the quarter tightens, and who knows?
- What does the most senior person in the room let pass without comment?

The standard

The standard in any room is the worst behaviour the most senior person present is willing to let pass. Change what leaders tolerate and reward, hold it for two quarters, and the culture follows.

Ninety-day reinforcement plan

Measurement without reinforcement decays into wallpaper. The first ninety days after this analysis are scripted.

THE CADENCE

WHEN	WHAT	WHO
Week 1	Findings shared with all staff in plain language, including the uncomfortable ones; interventions and owners named	CEO
Weeks 2-6	Tools sprint runs with weekly visible fixes; workload analysis fieldwork in the two functions	CTO, COO
Week 6	Leadership consequences audit (page six); three tolerance changes agreed and written down	Executive team
Weeks 6-12	Workload redesign decisions executed; stop-list published; recognition standard modelled in every leadership meeting	COO, all managers
Week 13	Mini-pulse on the three moved drivers only; results shared whatever they say	CPO

WHAT THE BOARD SEES

- One page, monthly: the four interventions, their measures, movement, and the single decision needed if any stalls.
- The pulse trend quarterly, by function, with the range shown as prominently as the mean.

The share-it-anyway rule

Week-13 results are published whether they flatter or not. One honest disappointing update buys more engagement than a year of curated good news, because people already know the truth; what they are watching is whether leadership says it.

About Red Cell Consulting

Consulting and advisory, backed by platforms we design, build and operate ourselves.

Red Cell Consulting is a multi-disciplinary consultancy working across enterprise and technology, financial analysis, clinical psychology and behavioural science, advisory and investment readiness, restructuring, management consulting and AI governance. The distinctive part is that we also build: our platforms, including Recursys for deal intelligence, Myra for deterministic financial analysis and ADMRL for structured clinical reporting, run in production under the same disciplines we recommend to clients. When we advise on evidence, testing and governance, we are describing how our own systems work.

HOW AN ENGAGEMENT RUNS

STEP	WHAT HAPPENS
1 · Conversation	A free first discussion of the situation. We will tell you plainly whether we can help and what it would involve.
2 · Scope	A short written scope: the question, the deliverables, the timeline, the fee. Fixed where the work allows it.
3 · The work	Delivered in the structure this sample shows, with working sessions rather than big reveals. You see findings as they form.
4 · Handover	Deliverables that stand on their own, and the option of standing support where it makes sense.

FOR THIS SERVICE

Behavioural consulting at Red Cell works exactly this way: observation with the survey, precision over broadcast, interventions that change conditions, and the leadership audit that makes it hold. If your culture deck and your Tuesday disagree, start with the conversation.

Contact

+61 3 9448 4933 · Mon-Fri 9am-5pm Melbourne

info@redcc.au

www.redcc.au